

## REMARKS

This second After-Final Response is submitted in response to the Advisory Action mailed January 11, 2012. This response comprises the after-final response previously submitted on 9 January 2012, with additional comments and amendments. These additional comments and amendments are summarized in the section immediately below.

Applicants acknowledge previous receipt of the final office action in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-5, 10-11, and 22-23 as anticipated by Ohzuku (US 7722989); rejected claims 1-6, 8-11, and 22-23 as obvious in view of Ohzuku in view of Hollenkamp (WO 2004/082059); rejected claims 19-20 under § 112, second paragraph; and indicated that claims 7, 12, and 15-17 would be allowable. Applicants have amended the claims and respectfully submit that the case is now in condition for allowance.

### **Response to the Advisory Action**

In response to the Advisory Action, claim 8 has been amended to recite that R<sub>1</sub> and R<sub>2</sub> are methyl and hexyl groups, respectively. Applicant respectfully submits that this designation is also apparent from the recitation of an *N*-methyl-*N*-hexyl-pyrrolidinium pyrrolidinium structure, but has amended the claim in order to expedite allowance.

Further in response to the Advisory Action, Applicant respectfully submits that, in claim 9, the AsF<sub>6</sub><sup>-</sup> is astatine fluoride and C(CF<sub>3</sub>SO<sub>2</sub>)<sub>3</sub><sup>-</sup> is tris(trifluoromethylsulfonyl)methide. Both are common anions, as can readily be determined in a chemical dictionary or by looking them up on the Internet.

Finally in response to the Advisory Action, claim 12 has been further amended as suggested by the Examiner.

### **Rejection of claims 1-5, 10-11, and 22-23 as anticipated by Ohzuku**

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of former claim 7, which has been canceled. Because claim 7 was indicated to be allowable, claim 1 and the claims that depend from it are now allowable.

Rejection of claims 1-6, 8-11, and 22-23 as obvious in view of Ohzuku in view of Hollenkamp

As described above, claim 1 and the claims that depend from it are now allowable as a result of the amendment incorporating the limitation of former claim 7.

Rejection of claims 19-20 under § 112, second paragraph

Claims 19 and 20 have been canceled.

New Claims

Claims 27-32 have been added, which depend from allowable claims 15-17. Claims 27, 29, and 31 correspond to original claim 2 and claims 28, 30, and 32 correspond to original claim 7; therefore the new claims do not add new subject matter.

Allowable Claims

Claim 12 has been re-written in independent form and is therefore in condition for allowance. Amended claim 1 and its dependent claims are allowable.

Conclusion

Applicants believe that the present submission wholly responds to the office action and places all claims in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the amendments be entered, the outstanding rejections be withdrawn, and the case passed to allowance.

If it would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues in the case, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEST, Adam Samuel, et al.

P.O. Box 2463  
Houston, Texas 77252-2463

By: /Marcella D. Watkins/  
Attorney Marcella D. Watkins  
Reg. No. 36,962  
(713) 241-1842